

Ecological site R046XC506MT Shallow (Sw) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ

Last updated: 7/19/2023
Accessed: 09/19/2026

General information

Provisional. A provisional ecological site description has undergone quality control and quality assurance review. It contains a working state and transition model and enough information to identify the ecological site.

Associated sites

R046XC505MT	Sandy (Sy) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ
R046XC508MT	Silty (Si) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ
R046XC514MT	Gravelly (Gr) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ
R046XC517MT	Very Shallow (VSw) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ
R046XC599MT	Thin Breaks (TB) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ

Similar sites

R046XC598MT	Shallow Clay (SwC) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ The Shallow Clay site varies by texture.
R046XC505MT	Sandy (Sy) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ The Sandy site varies by being over 20 inches deep and having significantly more production and plant cover.
R046XC517MT	Very Shallow (VSw) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ The Very Shallow site is less than 10 inches deep, or has a water holding capacity of 2 inches or less.
R046XC508MT	Silty (Si) RRU 46-C 13-19 PZ The Silty site varies by being over 20 inches deep and having significantly more production and plant cover.

Table 1. Dominant plant species

Tree	Not specified
Shrub	Not specified
Herbaceous	(1) <i>Pseudoroegneria spicata</i> (2) <i>Festuca idahoensis</i>

Physiographic features

This ecological site occurs on nearly level to very steep plains, shoulders and sideslopes of hills, and bedrock escarpments, and often occurs in complex with other ecological sites. This site occurs on all slopes and exposures. Aspect may be significant, especially on steep and very steep slopes. Variations in plant community composition and production can result due to aspect. Runoff and potential for water erosion are important features of this site. The amount of exposed rock outcrop tends to increase as slopes increase.

Table 2. Representative physiographic features

Landforms	(1) Hill (2) Ridge (3) Escarpment
Flooding frequency	None
Ponding frequency	None
Slope	0 – 60 %
Water table depth	150 cm
Aspect	Aspect is not a significant factor

Climatic features

See Climatic Data Sheet for more details (Section II of the Field Office Technical Guide) or reference the following climatic web site: <http://www.wrcc.sage.dri.edu/> .

Table 3 Representative climatic features

Frost-free period (characteristic range)	70-90 days
Freeze-free period (characteristic range)	110-120 days
Precipitation total (characteristic range)	380-430 mm

Frost-free period (actual range)	50-90 days
Freeze-free period (actual range)	100-130 days
Precipitation total (actual range)	360-480 mm
Frost-free period (average)	80 days
Freeze-free period (average)	120 days
Precipitation total (average)	430 mm

- (1) RAYNESFORD 2 NNW [USC00246902], Raynesford, MT
- (2) STANFORD [USC00247864], Stanford, MT
- (3) LEWISTOWN MUNI AP [USW00024036], Lewistown, MT
- (4) ZORTMAN [USC00249900], Zortman, MT
- (5) DENTON [USC00242347], Denton, MT
- (6) HOBSON [USC00244193], Hobson, MT

Influencing water features

None

Soil features

These soils are 10 to 20 inches deep to hard rock or soft beds. Few roots penetrate deeper than 20 inches. Surface textures are mainly silt loam, loam, sandy loam, fine sandy loam, loamy fine sand, and very fine sandy loam. The soils developed mainly from granite, sandstone, siltstone, or limestone, and occasionally from volcanic rocks. Available Water Capacity to 20-inch depth is 2 to 4 inches.

Table 4. Representative soil features

Surface texture	(1) Gravelly silt loam (2) Loam (3) Sandy loam
Drainage class	Well drained to somewhat excessively drained
Permeability class	Moderate to moderately rapid
Soil depth	30 – 50 cm
Available water capacity (0-101.6cm)	5.08 – 10.16 cm

Electrical conductivity (0-101.6cm)	Not specified
Soil reaction (1:1 water) (0-101.6cm)	6.6 – 8.4
Subsurface fragment volume <=3" (Depth not specified)	0 – 40 %

Ecological dynamics

This site developed under Northern Rocky Mountain Foothills climatic conditions, which included the natural influence of large herbivores and occasional fire. The plant community upon which interpretations are primarily based is the Historic Climax Plant Community (HCPC). This community is described as a reference to understand the original potential of this site, and is not always considered to be the management goal for every acre of rangeland.

The following descriptions should enable the landowner or manager to better understand which plant communities occupy their land, and assist with setting goals for vegetation management. It can also be useful to understand the environmental and economic values of each plant community.

This site is considered moderately resilient to disturbance as it has only moderate soil limitations for plant growth. Changes may occur to the Historic Climax Plant Community due to management actions and/or climatic conditions. Under continued adverse impacts, a moderate decline in vegetative vigor and composition will occur. Under favorable vegetative management treatments the site can more readily return to the Historic Climax Plant Community (HCPC).

Continual adverse impacts to the site over a period of years results in a departure from the HCPC, with a decrease of the taller, more palatable species such as bluebunch wheatgrass, little bluestem, tall needlegrasses, plains muhly, purple and white prairieclovers, and dotted gayfeather. These plants will be replaced by Idaho fescue, needleandthread, thickspike/western wheatgrass, threadleaf sedge, Cusick bluegrass, Parry danthonia, various other increaser short grasses, and increaser forbs. Shrubs such as silver sagebrush may occur under certain conditions, sometimes related to fire occurrence and frequency. Continued deterioration results in increased amounts of red or Fendler's threeawn and fringed sagewort.

Plants that are not a part of the climax community that are most likely to invade are cheatgrass and Japanese bromes, six-weeks fescue, broom snakeweed, and thistles. There are several noxious weeds that are also likely to invade this site including spotted knapweed, leafy spurge, dalmation toadflax, and sulphur cinquefoil.

State and transition model

Additional community tables

Table 5. Community 1.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
Shrub/Vine					
0				0-87	
	Shrub, broadleaf	2SB	<i>Shrub, broadleaf</i>	0-87	–
	silver sagebrush	ARCAV2	<i>Artemisia cana ssp. viscidula</i>	0-87	–
	prairie sagewort	ARFR4	<i>Artemisia frigida</i>	0-87	–
	prairie rose	ROAR3	<i>Rosa arkansana</i>	0-87	–
	common snowberry	SYAL	<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>	0-87	–
	broom snakeweed	GUSA2	<i>Gutierrezia sarothrae</i>	0-1	–

Grass/Grasslike					
0	Grasses and Sedges			968-1399	
	bluebunch wheatgrass	PSSP6	<i>Pseudoroegneria spicata</i>	484-1224	–
	little bluestem	SCSCD	<i>Schizachyrium scoparium</i> var. <i>divergens</i>	0-437	–
	porcupinegrass	HESP11	<i>Hesperostipa spartea</i>	0-350	–
	Idaho fescue	FEID	<i>Festuca idahoensis</i>	61-262	–
	needle and thread	HECOC8	<i>Hesperostipa comata</i> ssp. <i>comata</i>	0-139	–
	western wheatgrass	PASM	<i>Pascopyrum smithii</i>	0-87	–
	Sandberg bluegrass	POSE	<i>Poa secunda</i>	48-87	–
	prairie Junegrass	KOMA	<i>Koeleria macrantha</i>	48-87	–
	plains muhly	MUCU3	<i>Muhlenbergia cuspidata</i>	0-87	–
	Grass, perennial	2GP	<i>Grass, perennial</i>	0-87	–
	blue grama	BOGR2	<i>Bouteloua gracilis</i>	48-87	–
	needleleaf sedge	CADU6	<i>Carex duriuscula</i>	48-87	–
	threadleaf sedge	CAFI	<i>Carex filifolia</i>	48-87	–
	plains reedgrass	CAMO	<i>Calamagrostis montanensis</i>	48-87	–
	thickspike wheatgrass	ELLAL	<i>Elymus lanceolatus</i> ssp. <i>lanceolatus</i>	0-87	–
	Letterman's needlegrass	ACLE9	<i>Achnatherum lettermanii</i>	0-44	–
	Columbia needlegrass	ACNEN2	<i>Achnatherum nelsonii</i> ssp. <i>nelsonii</i>	0-44	–
	western needlegrass	ACOCO	<i>Achnatherum occidentale</i> ssp. <i>occidentale</i>	0-44	–
	green needlegrass	NAVI4	<i>Nassella viridula</i>	0-44	–
	purple threeawn	ARPU9	<i>Aristida purpurea</i>	0-1	–
	Fendler's threeawn	ARPUF	<i>Aristida purpurea</i> var. <i>fendleriana</i>	0-1	–
Forb					
0	Forbs			61-175	
	Forb, perennial	2FP	<i>Forb, perennial</i>	0-87	–
	western yarrow	ACMIO	<i>Achillea millefolium</i> var. <i>occidentalis</i>	0-87	–
	pale agoseris	AGGL	<i>Agoseris glauca</i>	0-87	–
	onion	ALLIU	<i>Allium</i>	0-87	–
	pussytoes	ANTEN	<i>Antennaria</i>	0-87	–
	aster	ASTER	<i>Aster</i>	0-87	–
	milkvetch	ASTRA	<i>Astragalus</i>	0-87	–
	balsamroot	BALSA	<i>Balsamorhiza</i>	0-87	–
	prairie clover	DALEA	<i>Dalea</i>	1-87	–
	Bonneville shootingstar	DOCO	<i>Dodecatheon conjugens</i>	0-87	–
	yellow fritillary	FRPU2	<i>Fritillaria pudica</i>	0-87	–
	old man's whiskers	GETR	<i>Geum triflorum</i>	0-87	–
	sticky purple geranium	GEVI2	<i>Geranium viscosissimum</i>	1-87	–
	dotted blazing star	LIPU	<i>Liatris punctata</i>	1-87	–
	western stoneseed	LIRU4	<i>Lithospermum ruderales</i>	0-87	–
	desertparsley	LOMAT	<i>Lomatium</i>	0-87	–
	wildparsley	MUSIN	<i>Musineon</i>	0-87	–
	locoweed	OXYTR	<i>Oxytropis</i>	0-87	–
	beardtongue	PENST	<i>Penstemon</i>	0-87	–
	spiny phlox	PHHO	<i>Phlox hoodii</i>	0-87	–
	scurfpea	PSORA2	<i>Psoraleidum</i>	0-87	–

	cutleaf anemone	PUPAM	<i>Pulsatilla patens ssp. multifida</i>	0-87	–
	prairie thermopsis	THRH	<i>Thermopsis rhombifolia</i>	0-87	–
	American vetch	VIAM	<i>Vicia americana</i>	0-87	–
	deathcamas	ZIGAD	<i>Zigadenus</i>	0-1	–
	larkspur	DELPH	<i>Delphinium</i>	0-1	–

Table 6. Community 2.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 7. Community 3.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Table 8. Community 4.1 plant community composition

Group	Common Name	Symbol	Scientific Name	Annual Production ()	Foliar Cover (%)
-------	-------------	--------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------

Animal community

Livestock Grazing Interpretations: Managed livestock grazing is suitable on this site as it has the potential to produce a limited amount of high quality forage. Grazing must be managed carefully on this site to be sure livestock drift onto the better, more productive sites is not excessive. Management objectives should include maintenance or improvement of the plant community. Shorter grazing periods and adequate re-growth after grazing are recommended for plant maintenance and recovery. Heavy stocking and season-long use of this site can be detrimental and will alter the plant community composition and production over time. Using shorter grazing periods and providing for adequate re-growth after grazing are recommended for plant maintenance, health, and recovery. Continual over stocking and season-long use of this site can be detrimental and will alter the plant composition and production over time. The result will be plant communities that resemble numbers 3 and 4, depending on how long this grazing management is used as well as other circumstances such as weather conditions and fire frequency. Whenever Plant Community 2 (medium and short grasses) occurs, grazing management strategies that will prevent further degradation need to be implemented. This community is still stable, productive, and healthy provided it receives proper management. It will respond fairly quickly to improved grazing management, including increased growing season rest of key forage plants. Grazing management alone can usually move this back towards the potential / historic climax community. Plant community 3 is the result of long-term, heavy, continuous grazing and/or annual, early spring seasonal grazing. Repeated heavy early spring grazing, especially during stem elongation (generally mid May through mid June), can also have detrimental affects on the taller, key forage species. Repeated spring grazing depletes stored carbohydrates, resulting in weakening and eventual death of the cool season tall and medium grasses. This plant community can occur throughout the pasture, on spot grazed areas, and around water sources where season-long grazing patterns occur. Plant Communities 3 and 4 have a high percentage of aggressive, less-desirable species. Once these have become established, it is significantly more difficult using grazing management alone to restore the site to one that resembles the HCPC. It becomes critical at this point to implement a grazing strategy that will restore the stability and health of the site. Additional rest, sometimes for the growing season, or more probable for a full year or more, is often necessary for re-establishment of the desired species. There are limitations to using mechanical treatment on this site due to the shallow soils. Calculating Safe Stocking Rates: Proper stocking rates should be incorporated into a grazing management strategy that protects the resource, maintains or improves rangeland health, and is consistent with management objectives. Safe stocking rates will be based on useable forage production, and should consider ecological condition and trend of the site, and past grazing use history. Calculations used to determine a safe stocking rate are based on the amount of useable forage available, taking into account the harvest efficiency of the animal and the grazing strategy to be implemented. Average annual production must be measured or estimated to properly assess useable forage production and stocking rates. Stocking rates are calculated from average forage production values using a 25% Harvest Efficiency factor for preferred and desirable plants, and 10% Harvest Efficiency for less desirable species. AUM calculations are based on 915 pounds (air-dry) per animal unit month (AUM) for a 1,000-pound cow with calf up to 4 months. No adjustments have been made for site grazability factors, such as steep slopes, site inaccessibility, or distance to drinking water. The following is an example of how to calculate the recommended stocking rate. This example does not use production estimates from this specific ecological site. You will need to adjust the annual production values and run the calculations using total annual production values from the ecological sites encountered on each individual ranch/pasture. Before making specific recommendations, an on-site evaluation must be made. Example of total annual production amounts by type of year: Favorable years = 2200 lbs/acre Normal years = 1480 lbs/acre Unfavorable years = 1200 lbs/acre It is recommended that on slopes of 30% or less, stocking rate should be derived from the total annual production pounds minus 500 pounds for residual dry matter and 25% harvest efficiency. On slopes over 30%, stocking rate is derived from total annual production pounds minus 800 pounds for residual dry matter and 25% harvest efficiency. Refer to the NRCS National Range and Pasture Handbook for a list of Animal Unit Equivalents. Sample Calculations using Favorable Year production amounts: 30% slopes: $AUM/AC = [(2200-500)(0.25)]/915$ lbs/month for one AU = 0.46 AUM/AC $AC/AUM = (1.0 AU)/(0.46AUM/AC) = 2.2 AC/AUM$ > 30% slopes: $AUM/AC = [(2200-800)(0.25)]/915$ lbs/month for one AU = 0.38 AUM/AC $AC/AUM = (1.0 AU)/(0.38 AU/AC) = 2.6 AC/AUM$ NOTE: 915 lbs/month for one Animal Unit is used as the baseline for maintenance requirements. This equates to 30 lbs/day of air-dry forage (1200 lb cow at 2.5% of body weight).

Hydrological functions

The runoff potential for this site is low to moderate, depending on slope and ground cover/health. Runoff curve numbers generally range from 78 to 90. The soils associated with this ecological site are generally in Hydrologic Soil Group C. The infiltration rates for these soils will normally be moderate to moderately rapid. Good hydrologic conditions exist on rangelands if plant cover (grass, litter, and brush canopy) is greater than 70%. Fair conditions exist when cover is between 30 and 70%, and poor conditions exist when cover is less than 30%. Sites in high similarity to HCPC (Plant Communities 1a, 1b, 1c, and 2) generally have enough plant cover and litter to optimize infiltration, minimize runoff and erosion, and have a good hydrologic condition. The deep root systems of the potential vegetation help maintain or increase infiltration rates and reduce runoff. Sites in low similarity (Plant Communities 3 and 4) are generally considered to be in poor hydrologic condition as the majority of plant cover is from shallow-rooted species such as blue grama, annual grasses, and shrubs. Erosion is minor for sites in high similarity. Rills and gullies should not be present. Water flow patterns, if present, will be barely observable. Plant pedestals are essentially non-existent. Plant litter remains in place and is not moved by erosion. Soil surfaces should not be compacted or crusted. Plant cover and litter helps retain soil moisture for use by the plants. Maintaining a healthy stand of perennial vegetation will optimize the amount of precipitation that is received. (Reference: Engineering Field Manual, Chapter 2 and Montana Supplement 4).

Recreational uses

This site provides some recreational opportunities for hiking, horseback riding, big game and upland bird hunting. The forbs have flowers that appeal to photographers. This site provides valuable open space and visual aesthetics. Caution should be used during wet weather periods.

Wood products

None.

Contributors

Matt Ricketts

RL; BG; MR; PH

Robert Leinard; Barbara Gibbons; Matt Ricketts; Peter Husby, Jon Siddoway

Approval

Kirt Walstad, 7/19/2023

Rangeland health reference sheet

Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health is a qualitative assessment protocol used to determine ecosystem condition based on benchmark characteristics described in the Reference Sheet. A suite of 17 (or more) indicators are typically considered in an assessment. The ecological site(s) representative of an assessment location must be known prior to applying the protocol and must be verified based on soils and climate. Current plant community cannot be used to identify the ecological site.

Author(s)/participant(s)	G. Petersen K. Walstad
Contact for lead author	grant.petersen@usda.gov
Date	03/01/2020
Approved by	
Approval date	

Composition (Indicators 10 and 12) based on	Annual Production
---	-------------------

Indicators

1. **Number and extent of rills:** Rills are generally not present in the reference condition. If present they will be short and inconspicuous on steeper slopes.

2. **Presence of water flow patterns:** Water flow patterns are generally not present in the reference condition but may be present on the steeper, south facing slopes when runoff exceeds infiltration. These patterns will be short and infrequent across gentle slopes and increasingly more common on steeper slopes.

3. **Number and height of erosional pedestals or terracettes:** Pedestals are not evident in the reference condition. If present will be on slopes greater than 25% and associated with waterflow patterns.

4. **Bare ground from Ecological Site Description or other studies (rock, litter, lichen, moss, plant canopy are not bare ground):** Bare ground is 5-10% however steeper, southern aspects may express slightly higher bare ground of 10-15%.

5. **Number of gullies and erosion associated with gullies:** Gullies are not present in the reference condition.

6. **Extent of wind scoured, blowouts and/or depositional areas:** Wind scoured, or depositional areas are not evident in the reference condition.

7. **Amount of litter movement (describe size and distance expected to travel):** Litter movement is infrequent across gentle slopes and increasingly more common on steeper slopes.

8. **Soil surface (top few mm) resistance to erosion (stability values are averages - most sites will show a range of values):** The average soil stability rating is 4-6 under plant canopies and plant interspaces. The A horizon is 2-4" inches thick.

9. **Soil surface structure and SOM content (include type of structure and A-horizon color and thickness):** Soil Structure at the surface is typically strong to medium fine granular. A Horizon should be 2-4 inches thick with color, when wet, typically ranging in Value of 4 or less and Chroma of 4 or less. Local geology may affect color, it is important to reference the Official Series Description (OSD) for characteristic range. <https://soilseries.sc.egov.usda.gov/osdname.aspx>

10. **Effect of community phase composition (relative proportion of different functional groups) and spatial distribution on infiltration and runoff:** Infiltration of the Shallow ecological site is moderate to moderately rapid. The site is well drained. An even distribution of mid stature grasses, 70-80% of site production, cool season rhizomatous grasses 10-15% of site production along with a

mix of shortgrass, forbs and shrubs (5-10%).

11. Presence and thickness of compaction layer (usually none; describe soil profile features which may be mistaken for compaction on this site): A compaction layer is not present in the reference condition.
-

12. Functional/Structural Groups (list in order of descending dominance by above-ground annual-production or live foliar cover using symbols: >>, >, = to indicate much greater than, greater than, and equal to):

Dominant: Mid-statured, cool season, perennial bunchgrasses (Primarily bluebunch wheatgrass)

Sub-dominant: Shortgrass grasses & Grasslikes (Idaho fescue, needle and thread) = Forbs ? Shrubs.

Other:

Additional:

13. Amount of plant mortality and decadence (include which functional groups are expected to show mortality or decadence): Mortality in herbaceous species is not evident. Species with bunch growth forms may have some natural mortality in centers is 3% or less.
-

14. Average percent litter cover (%) and depth (in): Total litter cover ranges from 40-60%. Depth is thin and less than 1/2 inch thick
-

15. Expected annual annual-production (this is TOTAL above-ground annual-production, not just forage annual-production): Average annual production is 1250. Low: 975 High 1550. Production varies based on effective precipitation and natural variability of soil properties for this ecological site.
-

16. Potential invasive (including noxious) species (native and non-native). List species which BOTH characterize degraded states and have the potential to become a dominant or co-dominant species on the ecological site if their future establishment and growth is not actively controlled by management interventions. Species that become dominant for only one to several years (e.g., short-term response to drought or wildfire) are not invasive plants. Note that unlike other indicators, we are describing what is NOT expected in the reference state for the ecological site: Potential invasive (including noxious) species (native and non-native). Invasive species on this ecological site include (but not limited to) smooth brome, sulphur cinquefoil, dandelion, annual brome spp., spotted knapweed, salsify, leafy spurge, ventenata, etc. Native species such as Rocky Mountain juniper, ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, creeping juniper, lupine, broom snakeweed, Sandberg's bluegrass, etc. when their populations are significant enough to affect ecological function, indicate site condition departure.
-

17. Perennial plant reproductive capability: In the reference condition, all plants are vigorous enough for reproduction either by seed or rhizomes in order to balance natural mortality with species recruitment.
-